Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/820,740	TENG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alan Cariaso	2875
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>93</u>
(1) <u>Alan Cariaso</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>John Guice, Reg. no. 39699</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 5 September 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 1 and 5		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur</li> </ul>	n. The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
,		
ALAN A.		
PRIMARY EXAMINER		
(Examine PE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413B (04-03) Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed attorney that there was a discrepancy in the claims, namely that the claimed recitation "materials to form said wires comprise metals" in claim 5, dependent on claim 1, was incompatible with the recitation "each of the wires ... is made of polymer" in claim 1. It was the observed that the specification supports that the wires are made of either polymer or metal, and not in any combination thereof. Therefore, it was agreed to cancel claim 5 by examiner's amendment, included herewith...